UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,290	11/06/2003	Dan Tyroler	H0005391 (16881)	8063

128   7590   08/12/2008
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER
LAI, ANNE VIET NGA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
   Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05 June 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 4, 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by **Pucci** [US 7,064,663].

In claim 1, **Pucci** discloses an object locator feature 10 for use in a

security system (searching contraband, prisoner's personal possession and lost

objects or persons, col. 10, l. 40-64), comprising an integrated user interface with

a transmitter, a control, a keypad and output descriptive information display as

claimed (fig. 1a shows object locator 10 comprises finder 12, display 26,

selection 18; fig. 2 shows finder 12 comprises a transmitter, fig. 9 shows finder

12 comprises a display and a keypad), (col. 2, l. 38- col. 4, l. 20; Finder 12 may

be incorporated into a PDA, cell phone, blackberry, col. 6, l. 49-55).

In claim 4, Pucci discloses the claimed display (fig. 9).

In claim 6-8, Pucci discloses user enters descriptive text into the finder

memory, and the memory stores the identifiers of electronic tags (col. 6, l. 27-37,

col. 8, l. 60- col. 9, l. 29).

In claim 9-10, Pucci discloses the objects comprise inanimate objects or

living being (col. 10, l. 40- col. 11, l. 40) .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-4, 6-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Pucci** in view of **Wesby** or **Stilp** ([Stilp-1 [US 7019639] and

Stilp-2 [US 7053764] (all previously provided).

In claim 1, **Pucci** discloses a user interface as claimed (see above).

Pucci may not disclose a security system as defined in the applicant's

specification (i.e., home or small business security encompass intrusion and fire).

Wesby teaches a security system with an object locator feature (remote

asset management including locating, monitoring and controlling remotely the

use of fixed or movable assets (col. 1, l. 7-19), the security system includes fire

and intruder alarm system (col. 2, l. 5-58), comprising a mobile communication

means (mobile phone 170, fig. 2) that can communicate with a specific wireless

module 10 (electronic tag attached to an asset) directly or via servers (local

laptop PC server 140 or remote server 150) to locate the asset and to activate a

controlling function in the wireless module 10 (col. 4, l. 25- col. 11, l. 19, col. 15, l.

5-22, claims 8-9 and 13). It would have been obvious the mobile phone or laptop

PC of Wesby could be implemented with the keypad and selecting feature of

Pucci's cell-phone as design choice to provide the same expected result with the

claimed invention.

Stilp-1 teaches a home or building security system with object locator

feature, wherein RFID readers can be hardwired to a control panel (col. 5, l. 47-

48) or. the controller function can be located within RFID readers, the keypad, or

the alarm panel, the controller functions operate in a redundant mode with each

other (col. 6, l. 1-12, Summary of the invention in cols. 4-6); the keypad

comprising a memory, a control, an RF communication module and a display, the

keypad performs function as user input interface to arm or disarm the security

system or to activate the reader for locating objects (Stilp-1, col. 44, l. 46-64; col.

45, l. 45-48; col. 43, l. 34-61) (Stilp-2, keypad in fig. 5, tracking function in col.

15, l. 63-65). It would have been obvious the keypad phone-finder of Pucci can

be used in Stilp as design choice to provide the advantage of a selecting feature.

In claim 2, Wesby (col. 1, l. 7-19) and Stilp (Stilp-1, col. 44, l. 46-61)

disclose the claimed control feature.

In claim 3, **Pucci combined** discloses a wireless communication within

components in the security system.

In claims 4, 6-10, **Pucci** discloses the display, the descriptive information, the memory, the identifiers, inanimate object and living being as claimed (see above).

In claim 11, Pucci discloses a method for providing an object locator feature for a security system, comprising:

storing identifiers for electronic tags and descriptive information associated with a plurality of objects in a memory associated with the user interface device;

providing the descriptive information to a user via a user output to enable the user to select an object to be located; retrieving from the memory the identifier of an electronic tag associated with the object;

generating and transmitting a wireless signal encoded with the identifier to the electronic tag (col. 6, l. 27-37, col. 7, l. 52-54, abstract).

Pucci fails to disclose the requirement for a passcode and the transmitting of wireless enable signal to the security system control panel, which in turn sends a wireless activation signal.

Stilp-1 teaches only authorized user can perform certain control functions from the keypad (col. 44, l. 46-64) (edit descriptive information, col. 45, l. 25-48). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, authorization control using passcode is common practice. It would have been obvious a security system would not allow unauthorized user to change stored information in the system.

Stilp-1 (and Stilp-2) teaches a redundant security network comprising a

master controller and at least a backup controller, the controller (alarm panel,

control panel) receives input commands from a wireless keypad and sending out

signal to activate alarm or to activate the reader associated with RFID system

(Stilp-1, col. 6, l. 1-12, col. 42, l. 40-43; col. 44, l. 12-64) (Stilp-2, col. 5, l. 12-21,

col. 7, l. 54-57, col. 8, l. 49-54, col. 12, l. 38-48). It would have been obvious the

keypad of Pucci could be configured as design choice to use in the security

system of Stilp to issue a search function by itself or to command a controller at

remote location to activate the search function.

Wesby's claim 9 can be read as follow, in a closed area monitoring

system, an operator (a police representative) inputs via a user interface (mobile

phone 170, PDA or laptop, may be of Pucci's type, password is obvious) a list of

criminal records of people to a local server platform (may be called a control

panel as choice) (PDA, laptop PC 140, fig. 2) to enable the server to monitor the

presence of these people in the area (sending signal to activate the LCD screen

on the smart tags carried by the person).

In claims 12-15, Pucci discloses the input identifiers, descriptive

information, editing, and storing identifiers of electronic tags.

In claims 16-21, Pucci combined Stilp or Wesby discloses a security

system which operates in a computer environment, therefore a program storage

device to perform the method of claims 11-15 would have been obvious.

In claim 22, **Pucci** discloses the electronic tag comprising a memory

storing identifiers, a receiver receiving identifier sent from an object finder keypad

(cellular-phone, PDA, col. 6,l. 49-55), a control for comparing identifiers in the memory with the received identifier and a sounder generating a sound when a match is found (Summary of the invention, cols. 2-4).

Pucci discloses the identifier is retrieved by a keypad from a memory of a cell-phone where the finder is integrated with; the finder of Pucci is operated in a security system environment. Obviously the cell-phone of Pucci could be considered a security system locating device having a memory storing tag identifiers. **Still** teaches a redundant security network wherein a controller (control panel) can operate in place of other controller (control panel) if the other controller fails to operate properly. **Westby** teaches a security system comprising a local server (laptop PC 140, col. 15, l. 5-22) with object locating feature that receives a list of items to be search from an operator (police representative, claim 9), and the local server can access memories of other servers (shared databases) to retrieve necessary information (claim 9).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, the finder of Pucci with communication capability could retrieve identifiers from memory of any server (or controller) in the security system as design choice for saving its own memory space.

In claim 23, a PDA type object finder and server with input keypad for retrieving identifier is inherent or obvious in Wesby and Pucci.

In claim 24, Wesby teaches polling schedule (pre-programmed periodic status request, col. 15, l. 42-48).

In claim 25, Wesby teaches a security system with an object polling

feature (polling, claim 20), comprising a means for an administrator requesting a

local server or remote server platform (laptop PC 150) for polling a

programmable wireless module 10 (electronic tag with controlling function). In

Wesby, the requesting means could be a mobile phone 170 (fig. 2) and the local

server platform 140 or remote server platform 150 could be a control panel. It is

seen the claimed first control section could be on the mobile phone and the

claimed second control section could be on the control panel (laptop or PC

server platform; col. 15, l. 5-22) and the polling function is performed by the

control panel. A transmitter on the control panel (server) for transmitting a

wireless signal encoded with identifier is obvious for polling purpose. Wesby

teaches a system with possibility of share databases (claim 20, col. 32, l. 1-7, or

claim 1, col. 26, l. 1-11) therefore identifiers stored and retrieved from a remote

memory location is possible.

Wesby system lacks the descriptive information associated with the

identifier to facilitate user selection of objects to be polled. The phone-finder of

Pucci fills this lacking feature (see rejection claim 1). It would have been obvious

in a sharing network, a request can be sent to a remote location for object polling

and descriptive information is common practice to facilitate the selection of an

item from a list of items.

In claim 26, Wesby discloses setting instructions for the polling feature

(claim 20, col. 38, l. 37-39).

In claim 27, it is well known in RFID system, for battery power saving purpose the RFID tag is put in sleep mode during periods of inactivity and the tag periodically wakes up to check for signal (Wesby, RFID tags power down or auto-power up, col. 10, l. 26-42), (see also Stilp-1, sleep mode, col. 31, l. 13-17).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6.   In response to applicant argument regarding Stilp's RF reader. Stilp-1 discloses the reader can be wired to an existing control panel and the controller function can be located within the reader; also the controller function can be located within the keypad for the security system. Therefore it is seen the reader is part of the control panel and the keypad can perform the control function as well (Summary of the invention). See rejection above.

7.   In response to applicant argument regarding Wesby's wireless module is a PDA or a mobile phone. Westby discloses wireless module 10 is embedded within a mobile phone as smart tag (claim 8, col. 30, l. 38-55) and Wesby also discloses the use of RFID transponder tags in tracking assets (col. 10, l. 26-42), therefore it is seen the transponder tag may be a part of a mobile phone but is not a mobile phone.

8.   In response applicant argument regarding Wesby's keypad. Wesby discloses a user (administrator) requests a local server to perform a polling; It would have been obviously a request can be input via keypad (e.g., email) (or

sending identifiers as Pucci finder/phone), the keypad of Wesby may do not have

all claimed feature, however the lacking feature is disclosed in Pucci.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection

presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as

set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

   Irvin, object locator system with user select item from a listing of tagged

items. [US 6,297,737]

   Mauney, wireless handset phone with a find feature, user selects at least

one object via input keypad (abstract, col. 6, l. 9-29, (col. 7, l. 3-38, col. 29, l. 30-

col. 34, l. 51). [US 6,484,027].

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to ANNE V. LAI whose telephone number is

(571)272-2974. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 6:30 pm,

Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Hofsass Jeffery can be reached on 571-272-2981. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AVL

/Jeff   Hofsass/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612